

tactical critics have been these: they have formed two distinct sections—the draughtsman and the black-letter men: the two qualities are very seldom united in one person: the consequence has been, each party has brought preconceived notions to the field; and while one has laughed at the charter or chronicle as contradicting his views, the other has extended its evidence, and made it invade territories it never was entitled to possess.

Thus, while I have heard many claim a building as a Saxon church—while we have evidence of a first-rate chronicler that the Saxon building stood to the south, and was fairly pulled down when the new Norman building was finished on the north side—I think we ought to see whether the medal has not in some cases a reverse. For instance, I read that Waltham Abbey was built by Harold, who was interred there after his death; that the Conqueror deprived the monks of their wealth; that they got on as well as they could till the restoration of the Saxon line, when quite another school of architecture was in vogue; and yet I see in a most respectable publication this most unlikely criticism:—"Waltham, no doubt, built by Harold; yet the present church appears to be Early Norman." The inference is, that the monks, who at the time had not a groat to spare, pulled down a new church to build another new church in its site, of just the same size and style. Let us look at St. John's, at Chester:—we read that was the original cathedral church, and was completely renewed by Leofric, Earl of Chester, about six or eight years before the Conquest. Our next architectural annal is, that a fire occurred early in the 13th century. We see the architecture of two periods instantly, the one Early English work; and we see an older work, which has stood at least eight centuries, and is likely to stand eight more. Is it absurd, then, to take a stand on the written document, and doubt whether the elder part was not Saxon work? Again, let us look at Pershore: there we have a record that the old abbey, founded by Edgar, was burnt down, and that it was rebuilt, and public service commenced in it in the year 1002, only sixty-four years before the Norman conquest; a very great age for a Regent's park cottage, but a mere baby-hood for the noble fabrics erected at that time. Well, the next item in the Chronicles which have been carefully preserved by Leland, relating to the architecture, is, that part was burnt in 1223. We enter the building, and see two periods of work in a moment,—one clearly Early English, another earlier. What is the earlier? Are we to believe the Chronicle, or to say, No: there was some spell about the Norman invaders: they pulled down all churches, new or old, and rebuilt them in precisely the same style, just for the pleasure of doing so? In the case of Pershore there is a strong argument they would not do so, as we learn that they were in a great state of poverty, the larger part of their property having been transferred to the new Abbey of Westminster by the Confessor, and after him by the Conqueror. Surely they who rely so strongly on the Chronicles in the cases of Ely, St. Albans, and Westminster, will allow us common sense if we pause over them in other cases. Let us remember there was no sudden departure in style. The Normans were men of the same race and the same religion. We must not look for such changes as we see in India, where the mosque marks the advent of the Mussulman, and the church the rule of the Englishman, while the old Hindoo Temple stands by with its own distinctive features. Both Norman and Saxon must have had one common stock, the original Roman, and the later departure from even that style was not so great but there necessarily must have been great similarity between them.

Some writers have cut the knot instead of untying it, and said boldly that the Saxon churches were all of wood, like the little church of Greestead, in Essex; and they quote from the charter of King Edgar (A.D. 973) given by William of Malmshury, in which he states his intention of "rebuilding all the holy monas-

teries in the kingdom, which are visibly ruinous, with moulding shingles and worm-eaten boards—even to the rafters." But though a great many buildings might have been of wood, we have positive proof that for many years a great many had been built of stone. Exactly 501 years before the Conquest the Church of St. Martin, at Whiteborn, was built, says Bede (iii. c. 4), of stone, an unusual method among the Britons. In 627 Paulinus built a large and noble church of stone at York, and in the next year a stone church of beautiful workmanship at Lincoln. In 652 St. Finan built the church at Lindisfarne. "Nevertheless," says Bede, "he made it after the manner of the Scots, not of stone, but of hewn oak." Surely this exception, "after the manner of the Scots," would prove rather that the manner of the English was different. In 655, the monastery of Medehamstede was begun of "most immense stones." In 660, Lastingham was built of stone. A few years after, we meet with a curious passage in Bede, who states that Benedict Biscop was about to build the monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow, and that he crossed the sea and brought back with him masons to build him a church "in the Roman style," which he had always admired. He also brought with him makers of glass, who taught their art in Britain, which had not been known there before. It would weary you to run through all the recorded cases of stone churches for the next 400 years preceding the Conquest: suffice it to say, that in 674, we first meet with the expression, "polished stone," as used at Ripon and Hexham. Within the last century preceding the Conquest, Ely, Peterborough, London, Westminster, Winchester, Worcester, the White Church at Durham, Bury St. Edmunds, St. Mary's Coventry, Stow, Wenlock, Leominster, Aldborough, Spalding, Gloucester, Pershore, Waltham Abbey, and many more no doubt, which I have not had time to reckon, were built, and almost all these of stone. So much for the sweeping assertion that the Saxons did not and could not build stone churches.

The arguments relative to Saxon and Norman architecture have been something like those of Zeal-of-the-Land-Busy, in Ben Jonson's inimitable comedy, where the two disputants keep on for a quarter of an hour—"It is." "It is not." "It is." "It is not." Each person maintaining his own ideas, but giving marvellous little evidence for what he says. Let us endeavour to get some proof *aliquando*, and not rely too much on our own notions. First, let us examine several arguments that have been used, which do not seem to me to be conclusive ones.

We are told that Saxon work is much rougher than Norman, and is not ornamented. This may be so to some degree; but surely those who could execute such elaborate diagrams as we see in the Saxon MSS. could set them out for the workmen to copy, and if we judge from their arms and jewellery, they had no contemptible workmen. In one particular, which has been often quoted—the carving of fretwork—this must have been used by the Saxons, as the very word they used to express ornamentation is *gefehtan*. Besides this, we are told again and again, that the Saxons built of polished stone. Again, I can hardly suppose that wide joints are a distinctive mark. A celebrated authority has shown that there are wide joints in many decidedly Norman buildings. In fact, it appears to me that the execution of work of all kinds depends very much on the nature of the stone. If it were a hard substance not readily cut, except by the axe, it is probable that the joints would be rougher and wider than where the material could be cut by the saw. By the way, it is also probably a mistake to say the Saxons were ignorant of the use of the saw; at any rate, they have three distinct words to express that useful instrument. In the same way, I consider that the quality of the mortar is not a sufficient test: this depends very much on local circumstances, in fact, on the quality of the material from which it is burnt. Neither do I think the smallness of the stones to be a criterion. Hugo Candidus expressly tells us that

Medehamstede, or "Peterborough," was built of most immense stones, "*immanissimi lapides*."

The probable tests may be considered to be these:—Saxon work resembles classic Roman more than Norman work. The former succeeded their polished conquerors of the world, and no doubt entered their houses, where the fountains played in the impluvium, surrounded by columns of classic form. The whole land must have been full of arcades, vaultings, hypocausts, *ysti*, amphitheatres, and all the borrowed glories of old Rome, and would have given direct examples to their successors—while Norman art must have come through Gallic sources, and must probably was in some way tinged with intermediate peculiarities.

Another and a safe test will be to find peculiarities that do not exist in acknowledged and accredited Norman work, and yet which are not Roman. The latter is easily recognised by its superior workmanship, and identity with classic forms. If early work be not Roman nor Norman, what else can it be but Saxon?

But a still better test is the comparison with the delineation in contemporary MSS. Like the sculpture of Nineveh, or the tombs of Egypt, these drawings will best exhibit the every-day life; the costume and dwellings of the period.

What, then, are the peculiarities on which we can probably best rely? Quoins composed of pieces alternately long and short; round staircases of a peculiar form, on the outside of towers; short pillars resembling turned balusters; arches (so to speak) of triangular form; rude impostes, and pilasters formed of stones so narrow as to look like mere strips. With the two first we have nothing to do in this instance. Let me now call your attention to the illustrations of some undoubted Anglo-Saxon MSS., particularly the celebrated Pentateuch of Ælfrie, and the well-known Harleian MS. 603.

There you have the turned halluster columns—the alternate, round, and triangular arches—in instance after instance. Let us now turn to St. Peter's at Barton-upon-Humber: we have these characteristics exactly, as also the strip pilasters. The same character is found in the Tower of St. Bennet's at Cambridge, as a most cursory inspection will show: this has a small portion of strip pilasters also. It is to this last peculiar feature I now beg to call your attention. Every one must recollect the ordinary classic pilaster fronts. The girders of the doors or the principals of the roofs are placed over them, and the walling between them is of less thickness, and, of course, lighter than it otherwise would be. As classic art declined, the same external appearance was attempted, but in a very different proportion. There are very many examples, but the one in the diagram referred to is from S. Pietro in Cielo d'Oro, and was built at Pavia in 750.

In the inside, at Ripon, are two curious, rude impostes: they also strongly resemble those at Worth Church, of great antiquity, and which has always been considered Saxon, and those at Stoke D'Abernon.

The most curious and interesting feature is the crypt. These singular additions to ecclesiastical edifices no doubt derived their origin from the circumstance that during the persecution the early Christians availed themselves of the catacombs, which abound as much under old Rome as they do now at Paris. One of the most celebrated is given in the diagram. The remembrance of these sufferings was maintained by erecting these crypts, and all the middle of the thirteenth century no large ecclesiastical edifice seemed complete without them. They were used for all solemn services, particularly burials. The latest ecclesiastical crypts are, perhaps, those at Rochester. The earliest are probably those under our notice. They evidently are copies of Roman work: each column has a diminution and a swell, or entasis, always found in classic work, but never in any subsequent styles. They are also twisted in a style like Roman work—an example of which from San Paolo is before us. In the diagram I have also given a parallel between the ordinary